

a control unit (130, 132 in Youn, 27 in Jo and 32 in Smith, see col. 3, lines 60-66) getting a control signal in accordance with the remote command received through the network interface or the local command received through the operation unit; and

a power control unit (131 in Youn, 22 in Jo and as at 162 in Smith) setting a current power mode of the washer to any one of *power-on*, *power-off*, and *power-saving* modes in response to the control signal generated by the control unit. Also note the displays (140 in Youn, 24 in Jo and as at 158 in Smith). Re claims 10 and 11, Youn discloses the power saving mode (col. 8, lines 23-28).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Youn et al., Jo et al. or Smith.

Claims 2 and 3 define over Youn, Jo and Smith only in the recitation of the specific network interfaces. Nonetheless, to employ one type of network interface over another, is deemed to be an obvious substitution of equivalents (see MPEP 2144.06 SUBSTITUTING EQUIVALENTS KNOWN FOR THE SAME PURPOSE).

7. Claims 13-21 are allowed.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In Jeon, Shintani et al., Allan and Japan"478, note the control means.